

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are pending in the application. All of the claims are rejected.

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The examiner asserts that the term "non-annular" does not appear to be properly descriptive.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner. According to Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, the term "annular" means "of, relating to, or forming a ring". The individual indentations illustrated in Figure 4 are not continuous and, therefore, do not form a ring. They are merely individual arcs or segments of a ring.

The examiner also asserts that "non-annular" and "non-secant" are mutually exclusive. A secant is "a straight line cutting a curve in two or more places". *Id.* In the context of the present invention, the indentations are not straight. Hence, they are "non-secant". The indentations are curved, but since they are not continuous, they are "non-annular". Accordingly, Applicant submits that the terms are not mutually exclusive in the context of the present invention and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-9 and 13-15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gossman. Claim 1 recites "non-annular, non-secant shaped" indentations. The examiner asserts that indentations 11 and 12 illustrated in Gossman's Figure 1 are non-secant "in a lateral direction". Assuming that "in a

lateral direction" means in a direction into and out of the page, Applicant disagrees. Figure 1 shows one point along the length of the indentations taken at the plane of a section. The section conveys no information about the straightness or curvature of the indentation. The only shape information illustrated in Figure 1 is the cross-section of the indentation at the plane of the section. Reference must be made to another figure to determine the nature of the indentation. Figure 2 provides the necessary information to determine the shape of the indentation, and it illustrates a classic secant line intersecting a curve in two places. Accordingly, the indentations cannot be "non-secant", as claimed and Gossman cannot anticipate claims 1-9 and 13-15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 2-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gossman in view of Lacey. Claims 2-9 and 13-15 require non-annular and non-secant shaped indentations. Gossman's indentations are secant-shaped. Lacey fails to show indentations, instead teaching annular grooves and, thus, does not help overcome Gossman's basic shortcoming. Accordingly, applicant submits that the claims patentably distinguish over Gossman in view of Lacey and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 25 2003

Date: 9/23/03

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Veltman
Reg. No. 36,957

OFFICIAL